(15)

1889.
(R.R.)

File No. 74-89
Serial No. 1-16

Sub:- Complaint of Khan Bhadur Syed Ghouse Sha Khadri Regarding S. No. 53 of the Nagenahalli, Chikkamagalur-Taluk

G. R. S. IX 5[illegible]

Previous references

1859.

192

([illegible])

File No. 74

Serial Nos

Later references

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT

Serial No.

Part B for [illegible]

Complaint [illegible] Khan Bahadur [illegible] Shah Khadri [illegible] S. No. 3 [illegible] Nagenahalli, Chikkaballapur [illegible]

[illegible] Dist

[illegible] 16-8-92

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

Index

Memo:

Petition No. 1982 of 1889 from Rai Bahadur Syed Gow Sha Khadri of Baba Boodengerri, Chickmuglur Taluk, Kadur District.

Kadur Deputy Commrs. Report on the subject, Letter No. 501 d/ 3 February 1890.

11 June 1881. The Petitioner complained to the Dy Commr. that during the Coffee Settlement of Binda-gada Magani, he requested that Survey No. 53 measuring Acres 111-26 of Naganhulli village should be treated as his Inam land

land; and that he was then told his case would be disposed by the Inam Deptt, that in the Survey Map prepared in the year 1861, Nagan hulli village was also included as Inam and the Map was submitted to the Commissioner with all the records con-nected with the subject on the 3rd July 1872 with Docket No. 189; That this Inam was in his enjoyment for the last 700 or 800 years; that the Inam Rules distinctly state that

that when a person is in enjoyment of land for 50 years, the land should be confirmed to the enjoyer though he has no summud for the same.

In the Memo: dated 5 Novr 1881 prepared in the Chickmunglur Taluk it is stated that the Survey No 53 stands in the name of the Khadri and the marginally noted 4 men were cultivating a portion of it and these 4 men solicited that Pattahs for these lands might be issued

Abdulah Saibu	5 acres
Bulagai Mootta	5 D.
Mohamed Cossman	5 D.
Syed Mohiudin	3 D.
	18

in

in their name - On
this, the Dy Commr.
passed the following
orders. "If this
land is Gow Shah
Khadri Khan Baha
-durs ~~land~~ Inam,
Govt. levies no
Kundayam, and
the claimants can
settle the matter
with the Inamdar -
If the land is not
Inam, but the claimants
bought land, and
if the Puttadar is
Kabulee to the Sale,
it may be measured
into separate numbers
and pay Kundayam
Rs: 7 - 8 - " subject

t.

to adjustment after survey."

The Dy: Commr.

No. 826 of 7 Nov/81 requested the Inam Superintendent to inform him whether the Survey No. 53 in the Nagenhulli Village is Inam or not; and stated that Gouse Sha Khadri claimed it as "Surva Inam" but produced no Tittle Deed in support of his claim, and that as the No. in question is a Coffee number on which Kundayem has to be fixed and levied and as the settlement of the Bundegay Magani is now in hand,

the

the Deputy Commr.
requested an early
reply. and also
forwarded the Gows
Cha Khadree's petition
for information.
The Inam Superin- No. 149 of 14 Nov 1881.
-tendent replied
that as the Inam
to be hereafter con-
-ferred to the Peti-
-tioner will depend
chiefly upon the
old boundaries
of attigundi as now
recognizable, his
claim to land situ-
-ated in a village
of quite another
Taluk should not
be entertained for

a

that the land in question is held on the same terms as the lands of Dattatri Pitt, the same terms should apply - He (the Petr himself) however states that the land belongs to the village of Surgupi and not to Dattatri Pitt and under this circumstances the land No. 53 is Govt. land -

16 July 1889. The Petitioner submitted his Petition to the Dy: Commr. stating that the Inam Supt. had given him an order that the matter of his claim had been referred to the Dy Commr for decision

and that he had therefore petitioned the Dy Commr. praying that the lands in dispute which contained building sites, graves, matams &c. clearly indicating that the lands belong to the Durga might be personally inspected and a just decision passed after examining all the documents & records in the Petrs possession. Thereupon the Dy: Commr. in his letter wrote to the Inam Superintendent to the

h: 852 76 Augt 1889

grounds will clearly show that the land has been enjoyed as Inam attached to the Makkan, for the past 400 years;

(a) In the Summer the disputed land is shown as Suru-guppa Makkan and it is publicly known from time immemorial as "Jannath Nagar" or "Galuvena Khan." (Bamboo Jungle) - at a distance of only 1½ Furloung from the above is situated Dhuttatri Pitt - Jannath Nagar means the grave yard of Saints - It does not mean a separate village or hamlet -

(6) During the administration of the late Maha Rajah a claim having been set up by the then contractor of the Govt. Coffee gardens to the coffee produce of the disputed lands, His Highness the late Maha Rajah on the representation of the Petitioner's father, instituted an enquiry and passed an Order dated Magha of the year Survadharee (1828-29) to the address of the Amildar of the then Sacroypatam

Taluk

No. 189 dated 3 July 1862.
In an Order No. 282
sent by the Kadur
Dy Commr. to the
Lucknulli Taluk
Amildar in 1876
regarding the said
Maps, Jannath Nagar
&c are alluded to
as Inam lands.
(E) That the said
Overseer in 1861 wrote
to the Petitioner a
Yadee of 5 June 1861
asking him to send
Potails to point out
the boundaries of the
Inam lands Jannath
Nagar &c. —
(F) That from the
Survey of the Coffee
lands made in 1860
the existance of the
Inam

Inam lands Jannath Nagar &c. can be ascertained -

(G) That in the Pahani account of 1860 and also in many Khanesh accounts, Jannath Nagar is mentioned as Inam -

(H) That upon a misrepresentation of a Patail the houses built on the Inam lands of Jannath Nagar by the Servants of the Durgah had been improperly assessed with Mohatarfa tax upon the complaint

of

of the Petitioner, the Chickmuglurn Taluk Amildar wrote Yadi No. 230 dated 24th April 1873 to the Petitioner intimating that the tax had been cancelled.

4. That in the said disputed land No. 53 there are Mujjid, Musaferkhana, houses, Graves &ca. now in existence as per map herewith submitted. These facts prove that Survey No. 53 is an Inam land; That under the Inam Rules, the lands enjoyed as Inam for

50 years and upwards cannot be resumed.

The Petitioner submits copies of several documents to prove his points.

(Note) In the Pahani account of 1861, it is stated that Jannath Nagar is ~~said to be~~ an Inam attached to the Baba Booden Hill.

A.P. Kommaghur
9/3/90.

Precis of papers containing additional information called for in paras 2 and 4 of the decision in Appeal Suit No. 1826 of 20 November 1889.

Appellant.

Syed Gows Shah Khadri
of Bababuden Durga

As directed in the above the Superintendent of Inams was requested in this office No. 7106/P.32 of 2d. September 91 to furnish information on the following points:—

(a) Whether it is true that there exist a mosque and tombs in the tract (no. 53) claimed and that they have been in possession of the Petitioner.

(b) Whether it is true that Petitioner has had possession and enjoyment of the lands claimed and if so, in what manner. Have the lands been cultivated and enjoyed by the Petitioner free of tax and if not, what is the sort of enjoyment, which the Petitioner states he has had?

(c) Is it true that the land claimed is known as "Jinnat Nagar" by

repute?

(d) Do the accounts of Nagenhalli show that the tract claimed forms part of that village to exclude the presumption that it was ever regarded as part of Sürsuppa?

Also the exact area and assessment of the Inam claimed, and how much of it is now cultivated and how much is waste and how its produce is now enjoyed.

The Superintendent of Inams referred the matter in his No. 42 of 24th October 91 to the Dy-Commissioner, Kadur District, who in his Hukum No. 1229 of 2 February 92 directed the Amildar, Chickamagalur Taluk, to enquire and submit a detailed report furnishing replies to the queries propounded in clauses (a) to (d) of para 2 of the above decision -

The Amildar having inspected the lands in dispute in company with the appellant and village officers on the 17 February 93 and having taken down the statement of the appellant and also examined such other persons as seemed able to throw light on the

1-3-93

Vide depositions of Wahab Sab & Syed Ahmed of 22 & 23 Feby. 93.

26

to submit the ~~information~~ information above referred to.

In reply the Superintendent of Survey in his No. 53 of 26th July, 93 has furnished the following information

Survey Nos.	Coffee	Kharab	Total
53	98-10	5-12	103-22
138	8-4	"	8-4
Total	106-14	5-12	111-26

With the remarks that the figures may be taken as correct and tally with those given by the Dy. Commissioner with the exception of a difference of 14 Gunthas more shown as Kharab by the Dy. Commissioner, that Survey Nos. 53 and 138 both appear in the akkar-band as Kharab, that the former is waste and the latter cultivated and that the Dy. Commissioner's letter No. 1334 furnishes the other information called for.

BK

Under all the circumstances of the case, I would confirm the lands as Inam to the Darga on half assessed. The case however must go to the Dewan for final orders. — [illegible]
2/1/94

Rev. 5/8/96

The Dewan thinks that this should be disposed of in the Rev Dept.

Subd Bd for
6/8/96.

Post with usual course expressing Council with the other case of this

Pt. [illegible]
2.9.96

Issued.
[illegible] 4/9.

Office note

Appeal Petition Regd No. 1826 of 20th November 1889

Appellant: Khan Bahadur Syed Ghous Shakhar

This is an appeal against the order of the Inam Supt. refusing to recognize the appellant's claim to Survey No. 53 of Nagenahalli as Inam. The appellant alleges that the lands claimed formed part of his Inam village Surguppe ~~and~~ that they have been in his possession ~~and~~ that there are some tombs and a mosque in the land claimed and that the said land had always been known as Jinnat nagar.

The case was heard in Council in September 1891

by the Hon'ble Mr. Chentral Ron Pantalugam and Mr. Thumboo Chettiyar. No final orders were then passed. The Govt. however observed as follows:-

"There is nothing to show that the tract claimed formed part of Surguppe. On the contrary, the presumption is otherwise, as Surguppe is admitted to be a distinct village and its lands are not contiguous to the tract claimed. The latter fact however is not conclusive evidence that the lands did not form part of Surguppe; as in the former days it was not unusual for the lands of one village to lie scattered in different villages. As to actual possession, no evidence appears to have been taken."

With the above observation the Govt. requested the Supt. of Inams to state

No. 7106/P32 of 21/9/91

till the settlement of Inams to Ghous Shakhadri", and that they remained as such up to date.

The Exact area ~~and~~ ~~assessment~~ of the Inam claimed by the appellant is as follows:-

Survey supt's no 53 of 26.7.93

S. no	Coffee	Kharab	Total
53	98-10	5-12	103.22
138	8.4	"	8.4
Total	106.14	5.12	111.26

The Deputy Commr. reports that the tract ascertained to be Jinnat nagar is stated to comprise two survey nos. 53 & 138 of which the portion comprised in no. 138 is under cultivation, that the present holder of no. 138 was paying "Pancher wantige" to the appellant till the number was surveyed and measured by Govt., and that he has not* paid since then anything to either the appellant or the Govt. No information* regarding the assessment of the Inam claimed has been received.

On receipt of the above information the

* The Dy Commr. states that the reason for this is that the land was not brought within the operation of Coffee settlement.

* It was called for in no. 7106/P32 dated 21/9/91

records were submitted to the Council with a precis. The following order dated 2d January 1894 is recorded on the Precis:

"Under all the circumstances of the case, I would confirm the land as Inam to the Darga on half assessment. This case however must go to the Dewan for final orders."

Ind P.C
2.1.94

On the 8th January 1894 Mr. Thumboo Chettiyar ordered the file to be submitted to the Dewan -

BCN 16.10.95

The case was heard twice once on 17/9/96 & again on 17/8/97

orders have not been passed as yet.

23/5/02

Appeal Petition No. 1826 of 1889-96

Appellant.

Mr. Syed Gous Sha Khadri. K.B.
of Bababudan Darga.

The case was heard on the 17th September 1896 when the papers connected with the Inam settlement and maps of Suragupe and Nagenahally were ordered to be sent for. The following is the list of papers received with the Inam Supt's docket No. 418 16th November 96

No. A is the first patti.
" 1. Inam Register No. 165.
" 2. Inam Statement.
" 3. A petition from certain inhabitants of Chickamagalur Taluk addressed to the Asst to the Inam ~~Sub~~ Commissioner praying that the income derived from the Inams allotted to the Bababudan Durga institution be solely devoted to the service of the institution

that the ~~Inam~~ Makkandars be not allowed to treat the Inams as their private property and that they should not be allowed to alienate the same &c.

4 & 5 Correspondence between the Asstt. to the Inam Commr., the Amildar of Chickmagalur and the Inamdar for production of the papers ~~[illegible]~~ relating to the inclusion of the Sayer Bob in the collection of the Suraguppe Sarvamanyam village.

6. Purnaiya's Sannad of 1799 granting the villages of Suraguppe and Dasarahally as Sarvamanyam Inams to be devoted to the service of the Darga.

7. Maharaja's Sannad of 13/2/12 granting to the Darga ~~[illegible]~~ institution the Suraguppe Inam village as also some ready-money allowance.

8 Sannad of 1832 regarding the continuation as Inam a certain tract of Coffee land in the Attigundi village:

Subd as per verbal orders.

S.V. 18/2/97.

35. 9(1) Statement containing particulars of Inams attached to the Bababudan Durga

(2). Copy of order No. 764 ~~[illegible]~~ ~~[illegible]~~ of 1838

(3) An order from the Supt., Nagar Division to the Amildar of Lakkuvally Taluk, ~~[illegible]~~ ~~[illegible]~~ directing him to ~~state~~ send a statement showing the extent, income and ~~of~~ other particulars regarding the Coffee lands attached to the Bababudan Darga.

(4)(5),(6). Certain statements and maps.

10. Copy of the Inam Register of Suraguppe village.

Bbn. 9/12 This must be posted to Saneday. Soon disposed of. Fix a day which may suit Mr. Abdul Rahman Subdr. [illegible] 29/1/97

Do so
φ
30-1-97
B

May be posted at Mys on or to 18th 2/2/97

Before the Government of *His Highness* the Maharaja of Mysore.

Appeal Petn No. 1826 of 1889-90

Appellant. Vs. ~~Respondent~~.

Mr Syed Gous Sha Khadri K.B.
of Bababudan Darga.

Notice ~~not returned~~ served.
17. 9. 96.

~~Decision.~~

appt by Mr B. Sreeniwassiengar
Main settlement Papers & maps
of Singuppe & Nagenhalli ordered
to be sent for
Order reserved -
B.O. [illegible]

Papers & maps Twice
received (Ferist attached herewith)
Submitted to the 2nd Councillor
[illegible]

10/12/96.
recd 6.20 pm.
10/12/96. Council clerk
Bring up for posting
[illegible]
30/4/97.

~~Posted to~~
Heard on the 17th August
To be decided along with
the other case of petr. [illegible]

The decision of this case was first pursued
pending the decision in the other case
viz the petr's claim to hold Dattatripet
Parts I & II as Inam
The papers in the latter were subd
on the 14th inst.

Subd to 2nd Councillor

[signature] 16/9/98

Rd 7.P.M
16.9.98

No decision passed
Post for hearing again

[signature] 3/5/1901

Please see the Councillor's order in the other case also. (noted above)
CGR
3/8/01.

Posted to 1.11.01. Adjd. to 11.12.01.

Subd. to 2nd Jr.
7/12/01

Recd
7.12.1901

38

Before the Government of Mysore.

Petn

Appeal No. 1826 of 1889-90.

Appellant. Vs. ~~Respondent.~~

Mr Syed Gous Shah
Khadri, Khan Bahadur
of Bababudan Darga -

adj. to 13th & 14th Feby
1902

13/12/01

13/2/02

adj. to the next hearing date

13/2/02

R. 17/7/02
154

Central Jail Press, Bangalore,—7-7-99.—302.

39

Appellant by Mr
B Srinivasiengar

Govt. have gone over the case carefully & come to the decision that the land in question (Survey nos 53 & 138 aggregating 111 acres & 26 guntas forms part of the Darga Inam. The question of quit rents to be imposed will be referred to the Supdt of Inam ~~settlement~~ for settlement according to Rules

18th July 1902 Pt Madhava Rao

C Srinivasiengar

drafted
pm
28/7/02

No. 501.

4 Deputy Commissioner's Office,
Kadur District,
Dated Chikmagalur 3rd February/90.

(2)

To,

The Chief Secretary to the
Government of Mysore.

Sir,

I have the honor to for=
=ward as required in Official
Memorandum No. 498 dated 14th
January 1890 the accompany=
=ing papers relating to Khan Bahadur Syad Ghouse Sha Khadri's petition, re=
=garding Sur=
=vey No. 53 of the Nagen=
=halli Village,

1. Copy of this office No. 826 dated the 7th Novem=
=ber 1881 to the Superintendent of Inam Settlements.
1. Reply No. 149 dated 14th November 1881 from do
1. This office No. 885 dated 18th November 1881.
1. do No. 493 dated 24th June 1884.
1. do No. 645 dated 25th August 1888.
1. From Survey Superintendent No. 464 dated 25th September 1888.
1. To do No. 867 dated 2nd November 1888
1. From do No. 598 dated 14th do 1888
1. Copy of this office No. 852 dated 6th August 1889.
1. From Inam Superintendent No. 28 dated 2nd September 1889 with enclosures.
1. File of Kanarese Correspondence as per Ferist attached

Chikmagalur Talik.

2. The Khan Bahadur claims the

land as Inam ~~B~~belonging to the Baba budan Darga.

3. During the Coffee Settlement of 1881-82 Survey No. 53, Coffee, extent 111 acres and 26 guntas, of the Nagenhalli village, was held "Amanat" subject to future settlement.

4. The facts of the case and the correspondence that has taken place have been explained in this office Memo dated 25th August 1888 (enclosed)

5. The Superintendent of Survey and Inam Settlements was again addressed in this office No. 645 dated 25th August 1888 and the favor of a final reply as to whether the land was Inam or 'Sirkari' requested, and the last reply No. 28 dated 2d September 1889 received from the Inam Department decided that Survey No. 53 in

26

MYSORE

No 1826

9/1/90

Recd. thro' the Deem. Commr for enquiry & report

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

1 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

1647 [illegible]

2 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] [redacted] [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

3 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

4 [illegible]

[illegible]

1 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

2 — [illegible]

[illegible] 1828 — 29 [illegible]

[illegible] 1866 [illegible]

[illegible] 370 - 12 [illegible]

[illegible] 210 - 26 [illegible] 111 - 26 [illegible]

5 3 [illegible]

[illegible]

4 — 1866 [illegible]

[illegible] 4 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 1860 [illegible]

[illegible] 297 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 288 [illegible]

[illegible]

5 – [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 1861 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 352 [illegible] 1862 [illegible]

[illegible] 18 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 187[illegible]

[illegible] 282 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 1861 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

6 – [illegible] 1860 [illegible]

[illegible]

7 — [illegible]

[illegible] 1855 [illegible]

8 — [illegible]

[illegible]

9 — [illegible]

[illegible]

10 — [illegible]

[illegible]

1826.

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 5 [illegible] 1889 [illegible]

[illegible]

By Order

[illegible]

Under Secretary

No 1982.

2

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

125

I/P 51 No 486.

(3)

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE,

PETITION DEPARTMENT.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

The accompanying Petition No. 1982

dated 15th Decr 89 received at the

Dewan's Office from Guru Dattathreya

Peetta Makhandar

Sijada Khan Bhadur

Syzid Gowshakadri Saib

is forwarded, together with its twenty

enclosures, to the Inam Supdt.

for inquiry and

report

L.R 74-89-2

From the same 1977-10-90

Draft bd as per Councillor's order

SR

By Order,

BANGALORE,

8 Sept 1890.

Chief Secretary 10 Sept

10.

AR

9
10 94

52 1982 of 189

OFFICE OF THE DEWAN OF MYSORE
6738
9 OCT. 90
127

1890

(4)

From
The Supt of Main Settlo
To
The Chief Secretary
to the Government
of Mysore
Dated 7th
Desp'd 8th } October

Enclo no copies & ver corrce
No 41 of 1890-91

With reference to the Chief Secretary's Official Memo No 486/54 of the 8th ultimo, states that the land (no 53) alluded to in the accompanying correspondence has already been decided as Government land.

Reference
as
9/10/90

Submitted to the Council
15/10/90. AR

LR 74-89-3

Do the same Do 85-83 / 114 Do 19-10

A2
11-10-90

Inam Supttts Office.
Bangalore, d/ 7th Octr: 1890.

No 41.
copies

(4)

To,

The Chief Secretary to the
Government of Mysore
Bangalore.

Sir,

In returning the enclosures of your Official Memo No 486/54 dated the 8th Ultimo, I have the honor to forward herewith copies of the Correspondence noted in the margin, from which it will be observed that the land (No 53) in question has already been decided by me as Government land.

From The Dy: Cons: Kadur Dt No 852 d/ 6-8-89. To Do No 28 d/ 2nd Septr 1889.

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your Most Obedt Servt

[signature]
Supttt of Inam Sessn

D.

4/a

From
The Dy. Commr.
Kadur District
To, The Supt. of Revenue
Survey & Inam Settlements
in Mysore
No. 852 dt. 6th August 1889.

With reference to correspondence ending with your letter No. 598 dated 14th November 1888, regarding Survey No. 53 of Nagenhalli, Chikmagalur Taluk, I have the honor to state that your decision declaring the land to be Government was communicated to the Khan Bahadur.

2. But on the strength of your vernacular order No. 195 dated 8th July 1889 to the Amildar of the Chikmagalur Taluk (copy enclosed) the Khan Bahadur has now applied to me as Deputy Commissioner specially empowered to settle the Coffee lands belonging to the Bababuden Durga, to reverse your decision and to decide that the land called Jinnat Nagar, Galuvinkan, is Inam belonging to Jahaghir Surguppé.

3. The case is however a question entirely for the Inam Deptt. & beyond my power to decide especially after the decision conveyed to Col: Campbell in

Your

Your letter No. 598 of 14th November 1888.

4. As intimated in this Office No. 493 of 24th June 1884 the land is not in any way connected with the Bababuden Durga Coffee Inam lands except that the claimant is the Makandar being situated in the Village of Nagenhally on quite another Slope of the Hills.

5. I therefore request the favor of your communicating your decision to the Khan Bahadur direct at an early date as otherwise he will not be satisfied that I cannot interfere in the matter.

6. The Khan Bahadur's Petition together with a list of references is enclosed.

(Signed) G. F. Meiklejohn.

From.
The Supt. of Inam Settls.
To, The Dy: Commr
Kadur District
No. 28 of 2nd Septr: 1889

In reply to your letter No. 852 of the 6th Instant, I have the honor to state, that I consider that there can be no doubt that Survey No. 53 in question is Government land. My Vernacular order No. 195 of 8th July 1889, cannot be considered as deciding the land to be Inam.

2. The enclosures of the letter under reply are herewith returned.

"Copies" (Signed) J. P. Grant

J. P. Grant

Supt. of Inam Settls.

I
P. 94

56

(5)

1890

To
The Supt^t of Inam
Settlements

Dt 19th October/90

No. 8583
114.

LR 74-89-4.

Calling for the subn. of a full report of the case, explaining the grounds on which Petr. (Khan Bahadur Syad Ghouse Sha Khadri) claims No. 53 as his Inam, & the grounds on which it was decided by him to be Govt land.

From the Same 4 Dated 10-11-90.
From the Same No 61 9-7-91.

5782

No 8583/114 of 19-10-90 To

1-11

The Supdt of ~~[illegible]~~ Main Settlt

Sir,

With reference to your letter dated 7th Octr 1890 No 41, I am directed to request that you will be so good as to submit a full report of the case explaining showing the grounds on which Mr claims No 53 as his Inam, & the grounds on which it was decided by you ~~as~~ to be Govt land.

~~[illegible]~~

Mr
19/10/90

Mane &
[illegible]
19 Oct 90

[illegible]
19/10/90

Note

a full report is necessary as the correspdce sub's does not show that there was any final adjudication by the Main Deptt - Survey Supts No 598 of 14 Nov /88 does not make the point clear

19/10

9/P 74

58

1890

7832
20 NOV. 90
146

(6)

From

The Supt. of Main Settls.

To, The Chief Secretary
to the Government
of Mysore

LR 74-89-5

Dated 14
Desp'd 18 } November

Enclosure No. nil

No. 48 of 1890-91

Return
as
20/11/90

To the Comm. No. 9545/114 dy. 25-11-1890

With reference to his letter No. 8583/114 dated the 19th ultimo, has the honor to request the re-transmission of all the enclosures sent with this Office letter No. 41 (6738) dated the 7th Idem; to enable the undersigned to submit the report called for in the above.

[signature]

Supt. of Main Settls.

A3
21-11-90

DS

59

(General Serial No. 30).

1890.

From

(7)

To The Superint.
of Inam Settlements

Dated 25 November

Despatched 29

Received

L.R. 74-89-5

Enclosures No. 3 files of P.P.

General No. 9545

No. 118 P.P. 49.

This docket no. 48 of the 14 November 1890

As requested in the above, has the honor to ~~request~~ return the enclosures of his letter no 41 of the 7th October 1890

BO

[illegible]

(8)

No. 61.

In: 3 files of Ver: Papers & Amildar's report with 3 Enclosures & Eng: of Corr^ce

Inám Supt^ts Office,
Bangalore, d. 16th January 1891.

To,

The Chief Secretary to the Government of Mysore

Sir,

In reply to your letter No. 8583/114 dated 19th October 1890, I have the honor to state that Mr. Gousshákhádri K. B. has produced no further evidence than that which has already been furnished along with his appeal petition to Government in support of his claim as Inám of Survey No. 53 in Nágénahalli village, Chickmaglúr Táluk. (vide the correspondence ending with Amildar's report No. 1340/428 dated the 5th ultimo herewith submitted), and to add that the grounds on which the No. in question was decided by me as Government land can be seen from my letter to the Deputy Commissioner, No. 149

dated

dated 14th November 1881 filed with the said Correspondence.

2. It is evident from the record that the land in question is situated within the boundary of the Sircar village, and not within that of the Inám village.

3. All the Enclosures are herewith returned.

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your most obedt. Servant

[signature]
Supt. of Inám Settls.

D.L.

OFFICE OF THE
18 AUG. 91
DEPARTMENT OF MYSORE

No. 1058
63. Regd

Petition Sept as 18/8/91

Case adjourned to 24 September 1891 as (9)

Under Secy.
Govt. of Mysore.

Sir

The petition of Appeal of Gous Ghaw Khadri of Baba Budan Giri in the matter of an Inam Village Nim has been posted for hearing to the 20th. He has engaged me to conduct the appeal for Nim. I am told the case is long one and there are good many papers to go through.

HC

64

He has to obtain copies of the
Inst. of the papers. So, I beg
you will kindly have the
case adjourned to another
date (10 Sep.)

Yrs obdy.

[illegible]
appt's adv

18/8/91

Before the Government of *His Highness* the Maharaja of Mysore.

Appeal No. 1826 of 20th November 1889

Appellant. Vs. Respondent.

Syed Gows Shah Kadari
of Bababudandarga
represented by Mr.
Advocate L. Srinivasiengar

Decision. dy 11-9-91

This is an appeal against the order of the Inam Superintendent refusing to recognise his claim to a certain tract of land in Nagenhalli as Inam. Petitioner has no documents to support his claim. He states that the lands claimed formerly formed part of his Inam village Surgupe and that they all along have been in his possession. He adds that there is a mosque and some tombs in the tract claimed, and that the tract has always been known as Jinnat nagar.

2. There is nothing to show that the tract claimed formed part of Surgupe. On the contrary

contrary. the presumption is otherwise, as Surguppe is admitted to be a distinct village and that its lands are not contiguous to the tract claimed. This latter fact however is not conclusive evidence that the lands did not form part of Surguppe, as in the former days it was not unusual for the lands of one village to lie scattered in different villages. As to actual possession, no evidence appears to have been taken. The Superintendent of Inams will therefore be requested to state:—

(a) Whether it is true that there exists a mosque and tombs in the tract claimed and that they have been in possession of the Petitioner

(b) whether it is true that Petitioner has had possession and enjoyment of the lands claimed and if so, in what manner.— Have the lands been cultivated and enjoyed by the Petitioner free of tax and if not, what is the sort of enjoyment which the Petitioner states he has had?

(c) Is it true that the land claimed is known as Jinnat nagar by repute?

(d)

(d) Do the accounts of Nagenhalli show that the tract claimed forms part of that village to exclude the presumption that ~~they were~~ it was ever regarded as part of Surguppa?

3. If the enquiry shows that the lands have all along been enjoyed by Petitioner, though without documentary evidence, it will be a matter for consideration whether the land claimed may not be confirmed as Inam on half assessment – the rate applicable to invalid Inams.

4. The exact area and assessment of the Inam claimed, and how much of it is now cultivated and how much is waste, and how its produce is now enjoyed, should be stated.

5. The Petitioner will be directed to appear before the Inam Suptt.

By order"

A.S.
18/9/91
Under Secretary

No. 7106/P.32 21/9/91

Copy forwarded to the Suptt. of Inam Settlements with the V. papers received with his

No.

No. 61 dated 17th January/91.

69

'By order'

Under Secretary

P/

(General Serial No. 30).

OFFICE OF THE DEWAN OF MYSORE 18 NOV. 91 7739 P. 27

189

From

Dated 16-11-91

(12)

LR 74-89-10

To The Chief Secretary to the Dewan of Mysore.

Dated 16th

Despatched 16th November 1891.

Received

Enclosures No.

General No. 417
No.

Petition Dept
18/11/91

To the same No. 9217 P. 62 19/11/91

Adverting to the decision of Government on the Appeal Petition of Syed Ghous Sha Kadri of Baba-budan Darga for a certain tract of land in the Nagenhalli Village, received with Survey Superintendent's No. 42 dated 24th October 1891, has the honor to

18-11-91

request that the English and Ver:
:nacular Correspondence for:
:warded with this Office No. 501 dated
3d February 1890 may be kindly re
:turned, as they are required to
consult and furnish certain in:
:formations called for by the Inam
Superintendent on the subject.

H H Sparke

Dy: Commissioner
Kadur Dist

Amt.

13.

(General Serial No. 30).

189/ .

From

(13)

To

The Dy. Commr.
Kadur Distt.

Dated 19th

Despatched 25th Novr 1891.

Received

Lr 74-89-11

Enclosures No.

General No. 9217. R
P No. 62A

His Docket No. 417 d/16th instant requesting that the Canarese & English Correspondence submitted with his No. 501 of 3rd Febry. last in connection with Petition of Syed Ghous Shah Kadri of Bababudan Darga, may be returned.

Has the honor to state in reply that the papers referred to have been forwarded to the Supt. of Inam Settlt. for reference with Govt. decision No. 7106/P.32 d/ 15th Septr. last, and to request that the same may be

be called for from that Department.

By Order

A1

Under Secy.

Draft.

AR

78.

Ved. No. 9217/62 of 19/10/91 to Kadur

1893. 12646 2 93 Pet: 518

Petn Dor
Mrk
75

From

The Superintendent
of Inam Settlements in Mysore.

To

The Chief Secretary
to the Government of Mysore.

15

Dated 1st
Despatched 2d } May
Received.

LR 74-89-12

Enclosure No. (2 files Eng: & Can: papers)

No. 78.

To the Service No. 9276 15/5/93 17/5/93 29/5/93

His No. 7106/P.32 of the 21st September 1891, forwarding copy of Government decision in appeal No. 1826 of 1889.

With reference to the above, has the honor to forward herewith a copy of Kadur Deputy Commissioner's letter No. 1334 of the 27th March last, containing replies Seriatim to the queries propounded in clauses (a) to (d) of para 2 of the said decision; and to state that the Survey Superintendent has been requested to forward his reply to para 4

direct

direct to the Chief Secretary.

2. The 2 files of English and Canarese papers received with the Deputy Commissioner's letter in question are also herewith forwarded, to be kindly returned when done with.

Supt. of Inam Settles

D.S.

No. was surveyed and measured by Government. He has not paid since then any thing to either the appellant or to the Government (The reason for the latter is that his land was not brought within the operation of Coffee settlement)

4. The records received with your No. 57 of 19th December 1891 are herewith returned

I have the honor to be &c.

(Signed) H. H. Sparkes.
Deputy Commissioner
Kadur Dn.

"Copy"

[illegible]

Sd.

For Supt. of Inam Settls.

81

No. 47.

189 1076.

26 JUL. 93

From The Suptt. Mysore Red Sy

To The Chief Secretary to the ~~The Revenue Survey~~, Dewan of Mysore.

Dated } Bangalore 26th July 1893.
Despatched }

Received.

Enclosures No.

General No. 53 } 189
No.

LR 74-89-14

Submitting the information called for in para 4 of the Decision of Govt. on the appeal of Syed Ghous Shah Khadri of Bababudan Dargah No. 1826 of 1889-90 re the exact area & assessment of the Inam claimed by him.

Petn. Br. [signature] 26/7

82

No 53

17

Survey Superintendent's Office
Bangalore 26th July 1893

To,

The Chief Secretary to the
Dewan of Mysore

Sir,

I have the honor to submit the information called for in your Docket No. 19276 / P.F. 291-92 dated 15th May 1893 as first called for in Para 4 of the Decision of Government on the appeal of Syed Ghous Shah Khadri of Bábábudan Dargah.

2 The information required is the exact area and assessment of the Inam claimed by Syed Ghous

Ghous Shah Khadri in the village of Surguppi. The area claimed is as follows.

Survey Number	coffee	Khrab	Total
53	98.10	5.12	103.22
138	8.4	"	8.4
Total	106.14	5.12	111.26

The above figures tally with those given by the Deputy Commr. at Para 2 of his letter No. 1334 of the 27th March 1893, copy of which was submitted with Inam Superintendent's Docket No. 78 dated 1st May 1893 with the exception of a difference of 14 guntas more shewn as Khrab by the Deputy Commr.

The figures now given may be taken

85 (25)

Before the Govt of Mysore

Present
V.P. Madhava Rao Esqr CIE
&
C. Sreenivasiengar Esqr

Appeal Petn No 1826 of 1889—90

Appellant — Mr Syed Ghouse Sha Khadri, Khan Bahadur (since deceased) represented by his nephew Syed Murtyuja Shakhadri; by advocate Mr B. Sreenivasiengar.

— o —

Subject

Appeal against the order of the Inam Supt refusing to recognise the appellant's claim to Survey Nos 53 & 138 of Nagenhalli village as inam forming part of the appellant's inam village of Suraguppe.

— o —

Facts of the case

At the Coffee Settlement of 1881-82, S. No 53 of Nagenhalli village (since formed into Survey Nos 53 & 138) was left

LR 74-89-15

Draft for the appt of the 1st & 2nd Councillors

29/7/02

R 29/7/02

Approved 2/8/02

Chik Mugalur Taluk

Rd Mysore 2-8-02

left undisposed of pending an enquiry into the validity of the appltt's claim to certain lands as ~~of the~~ Inam ~~lands of the~~ ~~appltt~~. In 1889, the Inam Supttt decided that the lands belonged to Govt, as the lands were not contiguous to the Inam village of Swaguppe and as the appttt had no documentary evidence to substantiate his claim. The appttt having appealed to Govt and represented that these lands which were locally known as Jinnat Nagar had always been in his possession and that there were some tombs and a mosque thereon, the Inam Supttt was requested by Govt in their decision dated 11-9-91 to report on these allegations. The report of the Amildar (P. Srinivasa Rao) who made a local enquiry makes it clear that

the

Proceedings of the Government of Mysore, Petition, dated 16th August 1902

BEFORE THE GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE.

PRESENT:

V. P. MADHAVA RAO, ESQ., C.I.E.,

AND

C. SREENIVASIENGAR, ESQ.

Appeal Petition No. 1826 of 1889-90.

Appellant—Mr. Syed Ghouse Sha Khadri, Khan Bahadur (since deceased), represented by his nephew Syed Mrtyuja Sha Khadri, by Advocate Mr. B. Sreenivasiengar.

Subject.

Appeal against the order of the Inam Superintendent refusing to recognise the appellant's claim to Survey Nos. 53 and 138 of Nagenhalli village, Chikmagalur Taluk, as Inam forming part of the appellant's Inam village of Suraguppe.

Facts of the Case.

At the coffee settlement of 1881-82, Survey No. 53 of Nagenhalli village (since formed into Survey Nos. 53 and 138) was left undisposed of pending an enquiry into the validity of the appellant's claim to certain lands as Inam. In 1889, the Inam Superintendent decided that the lands belonged to Government, as the lands were not contiguous to the Inam village of Suraguppe and as the appellant had no documentary evidence to substantiate his claim. The appellant having appealed to Government, and represented that these lands which were locally known as Jinnat Nagar had always been in his possession and that there were some tombs and a mosque thereon, the Inam Superintendent was requested by Government in their Decision dated 11th September 1891, to report on these allegations. The report of the Amildar (P. Sreenivasa Rao), who made a local enquiry, makes it clear that the appellant's representations are true.

Decision.

Government have gone over the case carefully and come to the decision that the land in question (Survey Nos. 53 and 138 aggregating 111 acres and 26 guntas) forms part of the Darga Inam. The question of quit-rent to be imposed will be referred to the Superintendent of Inams for settlement according to Rules.

No. 259—P. F. 291-92, DATED BANGALORE, 16TH AUGUST 1902.

Copy of the above is forwarded to the Superintendent of Inam Settlements with reference to his docket No. 41, dated 16th November 1896.

No. 259½—P. F. 291-92, DATED BANGALORE, 16TH AUGUST 1902.

Copy forwarded to the Deputy Commissioner, Kadur District, together with the records received with his letter No. 501, dated 3rd February 1890.

H. V. NANJUNDAYYA,
Secy. to Govt., Gen. & Rev. Depts.

Exd.—C.R.

25

1902-03

GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE

PETITION

PROCEEDINGS

Dated 16th August 1902

Nos. $\frac{259}{\text{P. F. 291-92}}$ & $\frac{259\frac{1}{2}}{\text{P. F. 291-92}}$

Holding that Survey Nos. 53 and 138 of Nagenhalli village, Chikmagalur Taluk, form part of the Inam village of Suraguppe belonging to the Darga of Dattatripit.

SBP—29-8-02—200

89 [illegible]
p 16-8-1902

LR. 74-89-16

Twenty incls. as per [illegible])

No. 1826

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE,

PETITION DEPARTMENT,

The 16 Augt 1902

ENDORSEMENT GRANTED TO Mr. B. Sreenivasrenga advocate for appellant the late Syed Ghouse Sha Khadiri of Bababudden hills, Chikmaglur Tk

in reply to the appellants' Petition Registered No. 1826 dated 20 Novr. 189 appealing agt. the order of the Inam Supdt. refusing to recognize the appellants' claim to hold S. nos 53 & 138 of Nagenhalli village Chikmaglur Taluk as Inam.

Petitioner is informed that Govt. have decided that the land in question (S. nos 53 & 138 aggregate 111 acres and 26 guntas) forms part of the Durga Inam & that the question of quit-rent to be imposed ~~will be~~ has been referred to the Supdtt. of Inams for settlement according to Rules.

Enclosures are returned.

By Order,

Draft

For

Secretary

C1 & 2

14/8/02

a moment, and if Survey No. 53 is not entered as Inam, the land may be treated as Inam and assess-ed accordingly.

No. 885 of 18 Nov 1881. The Dy Commr states that the above Survey No. 53 has, during the late Jamabandi, been held as Inam pending the result of Inam Enquiry; and that should this No. be hereafter given over as Sirkar, the owner has been warned that he will have to pay the arrears of Kundayem; and that an Endorsement

to

to the effect has been given to Gows Sha Khadree. The Dy Commr addressed the Supt. Rev: Carney stating that in the Pro: of Govt. lately received, regarding Dattatri Pett and Bisugeri Mutt Inams, no mention is made of Survey No. 53 of Nagenhulli village, Bendaga Nagani, and requested to know whether the above no should be treated as Sirkar. He replied that the No. is Govt land and that if Khan Bahadur can prove that

No. 493 of 24 June 188

598 of 14 Nov 1888

the effect that as the case was a question entirely for the Inam Dept. and beyond the Dy Commrs power to decide, he should decide and communicate it to the Petitioner at an early date. In reply, the Inam Supt.

Docket No. 2872 Augt/89

informed the Deputy Commr. that he considered that there could be no doubt that Survey No. 53 in question was Govt. land. Thereupon the Deputy Commr. communicated the substance of the Inam

Inam Supt.ns reply to the Petitioner through the Amuldar. the Petitioner therefore appeals to this Office on the following chief Grounds.

1. That the Inam Superintendent assigns no grounds whatever that the land in dispute is Government land.

2. That the Survey Department has also unjustly demarkated the land as Govt. land.

3. That the follow-ing documents and

Grounds

Taluk to the effect that the lands attached to the Makkan extended to half the hill; and that the produce of the lands within those limits should belong as usual to the Durgah. This fact alone conclusively proves that the disputed lands have been in the enjoyment of the Durgah for the past 90 years.

(C) During the survey of 1866 when the tenants of the Petitioner were trying to usurp the

the lands belonging to the Durgah, the Petitioner preferred a complaint to the Superintendent of Survey who ordered that his claim in connection with the disputed land No. 53. would be settled at the Survey Settlement—

(*) That in the year 1861, the maps of the Inam lands attach-ed to the Mukkam were prepared by the Coffee Overseer and forwarded to the then Superintendent of Nagar with letter

No. 189

21

Submitted to members of Council.
14.3.90 M.

Adjourned to 10th September 1891
at 18/8/91

I do not clearly understand the case. The Income Comm's letter is not clear.—

Hearing
30th July 1891

Given notice to Pr. only.

M.C.
30/6/91

1-7-91

[illegible]

Subject under reference, submitted an Exhaustive memo of 8 March 93 prepared in English with his No. 968 together with a rough sketch of the lands under dispute to the Dy. Commr.

On the 27th March 93 the Dy. Commr. submitted the above and the records connected with the case with his No 1334 to the Superintendent of Inams and observed as follows:-

(a) that there do exist a mosque and tombs in a portion of the tract as claimed, viz., in original Survey No. 53.

(b) that the appellant had enjoyment according to his statement in having once had some lands within No. 53 cultivated by his relatives and others on condition of their giving him a share of the proceeds (5 seers per maund).

Note: No portion of No. 53 is now under cultivation except No. 138 which once formed part of No. 53

(c) that the land comprised within the boundaries of Nos. 53 & 138 is "Jinnat Nagar" by repute.

(d.) that the accounts show that the tract claimed forms part of Nagenahalli and not of

Surjuppe.

The Dy. Commissioner further added that the tract ascertained to be "Jinnat Nagar" was stated to comprise two survey Nos. 53 and 138 measuring in all ⊕ 111-26 acres, of which No. 138 was under cultivation, that these two numbers were kept in amount at the Coffee Settlement and they remain so till now, that the present holder of No. 138 by name Wahab Sab had been paying "Pancher Wantife to the appellant till the number was surveyed and measured by Government and that he did not pay the same either to the appellant or to Government as the land was not brought within the operation of Coffee Settlement.

	Nos.	acres.	Pmla
⊕	53 —	103 —	22
	138 —	8 —	4
	Total	111 —	26
	Khrab.	5 —	26
	Cultivable -	106 —	"

Vide his statement before th of 22-2-93

The Superintendent of Inams in submitting the above with the records received therewith stated that the Superintendent of Survey was requested to forward his reply to para 4 of the said decision regarding the exact area and assessment of the Inam claimed by the appellant, the extent under cultivation &c. direct to the Chief Secretary.

Docket No. 78 of 1 May 93

Thereupon the Superintendent of Survey was asked in this office No. 19276 / Pol-7.291-92 of 15th May 93

(a) whether it was true or that there were some tombs and a mosque in the tract claimed and that they had been in possession of the appellant

(b) whether it was true that the appellant had possession and enjoyment of the lands claimed, or if so, in what manner. whether the lands had been cultivated and enjoyed by the appellant free of tax, and if not, what was the sort of enjoyment he had.

(c) whether it was true that the land claimed was known as gunnat nagar.

(d) whether the accounts of Nagenahalli showed that the tract claimed formed part of that village & exclude the presumption that it was ever regarded as part of Surgnppe.

The following inform

ation has been received in reply to the above:-

(a) that there exist a mosque and some tombs in a portion of the tract claimed viz in original survey no. 53.

(b) that the appellant had enjoyment according to his statement in having once had some lands within no. 53 cultivated by his relatives and others, on condition of their giving him a share of the produce

(c) that the land comprised within the boundaries of nos. 53 and 138 is known as gumnat nagar by repute.

(d) that the accounts showed that the tract claimed formed part of nagenahalli and not of surguppe.

It was also reported that the two numbers above referred to were kept "amanut" at the coffee settlement with the remark "Amanut

Dy commrs no. 13
of 27.3.93

When this inform
was received no p
of survey no. 53 was
cultivation except
which once formed p
of no. 53.

40 (General Serial No. 29.)

1889

OFFICE OF THE DEWAN OF MYSORE 8546 5-FEB.90 624

From The Deputy Commissioner Kadur District.

To

The Chief Secretary to the ~~Dewan~~ Govt of Mysore.

(2)

Dated 3d

Despatched 3d February 1890.

Received

Enclosures No. E & C. record & petitions with Enc

General No. 501

No.

From the same. No. 417 dt 16/2/91

Forwards the enclosed papers relating to Khan Bahadur Syad Ghouse Sha Khadri's petition regarding Survey No. 53 of the Nagenhalli village, Chikmagalur Taluk.

B2 10-2-90 B2 6-2-90

question is Government.

6. On receipt of the Survey and Inam Superintendent's letter No. 598 dated the 14th November 1888, the decision was duly communicated to the Khan Bahadur. He was given 3 months' time to prove his title to the satisfaction of the Survey and Inam Superintendent that the land was inam, and was told that if he obtained and produced a revised decision of the Inam Superintendent declaring that the land was Inam it would be enforced. This was not done. Meanwhile in answer to this office letter No. 852 dated 6th August 1889 the Inam Superintendent's final reply referred to above was received. This office yadi No. 713 dated the 5th September 1889 to the

Khan Bahadur enquiring whether he wishes to keep the land as Government land and pay arrears of assess:-ment, is based on the Inam Super:-intendent's final answer referred to above. The Khan Bahadur has now appealed against this order.

7. The Petition of appeal together with enclosures are herewith re:-turned.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient Servant,

[illegible] Col.

Deputy Commissioner,

Kadir District.

A.W.S.

60

1890

9582

183

(8)

From

The Supt of Main Settl.

To, The Chief Secretary to the Government of Mysore

Dated 17th
Desp'd 17th } January

Enclosures No's 30 Papers & Amildar's report & No. 3 Enclo. Eng. Carte

No. 61 — of 1890-91

Furnishes explanation as to the circumstances under which Survey No. 5 in Nagendahally Village of the Chikmaglur Taluk was decided as Government Land.

Reference
[illegible]
20/1/91

Petition Dept
[illegible] 91

To the same No. 7106 d/15/21 19/91 P.32

Submitted to the Council

AR.

Cs 74-89-7

B3
22-1-91

65. Noted

1058 of 91

(General Serial No. 30).

189/ . (10)

From The Chief Secretary to the Dewan of Mysore

To The Supt. of Inam Settlements

Dated 15
Despatched 21 } Septr/91
Received

Enclosures No. VP.

General No. 7106 R.
No. P32

Forwarding copy of the decision on the appeal of Syed Ghous Shah Khadri of Baba budan darga, and calling for report on certain points connected with the appeal.

To Dated No 17209 of 13-4-93
Received No 7296 of 1-5-93

70

Ld 74-89-9

(11)

No. 1826

Appellant

Syed Gows sha Khadari, K.B.
of Bababudandarga, represented
by Mr. Advocate L. Srinivasiengar

~~Endorsement.~~

In reply to his Petition dated 20th November/89 Khan Bahadur Syed Gows sha Kadari of Bababudandarga is informed that he should appear before the Inam Supt. who has been requested to ~~is informed that~~ make a further enquiry & report

2. ~~The~~ Enc: ~~are returned herewith~~.

15/9/91

Mysore Dewan's Office,
Petition Department,
4th Septr 1891.

By Order,

16/9/91

Under Secretary.

Draft

AR

77.

15/a

No. 1334

Deputy Commr's Office
Kadur District.
Chikmagalur 27th March 1893

From,

The Deputy Commissioner
Kadur District.

To,

The Inam Superintendent
in Mysore.

Sir,

With reference to your Docket No. 42/1 dated 24th October last, and subsequent correspondence ending with your No. 57 of 19th December 1891, I have the honor to refer you to the accompanying exhaustive English Memo of the Amildar, together with a sketch, list, &c. attached thereto, prepared after a personal inspection and enquiry, from which it may be observed:—

(a) that there do exist a Mosque and tombs in a portion of the tract claimed, viz: in original Survey No. 53.

(b) that the appellant had enjoyment according to his statement in having

once

once had some lands within No. 53 cultivated by his relatives and others, on condition of their giving him a share of the proceeds (5 seers per maund). (Note – No portion of No. 53 is now under cultivation except No. 138 which once formed part of No. 53)

(c) that the land comprised within the boundaries of Nos. 53 and 138 is known as "Jinnat-Nagar" by repute, and

(d) that the accounts shew that the tract claimed forms part of Nagenhalli and not of Suraguppé.

2. The tract ascertained to be "Jinnat Nagar" is stated to comprise 2 Survey Nos. 53 and 138 measuring in all 111-26 acres, of which the portion comprised in No. 138 is under cultivation.

3 The 2 numbers referred to were kept "Amanat" at the Coffee Settlement with the marginally noted remark and they remain as such up to date. It is elicited that the present holder of No. 138 by name Wahab Sáb was paying "Paucher wantige" to the appellant till the

No.

⊗ Nos – ac: = gs
53 — 103 — 22
138 — 8 — 4
111 — 26

× A
till
=tlem
Man
Gous
=dri

80

(General Serial No. 30.)

(16)

1893.

From

The Chief Secretary to the Dewan of Mysore.

To

The Superintendent
Mysore Revenue Survey
Bangalore.

74-89-13

Dated 15th

Despatched 19 } May

Received

Enclosures No.

General No. 19276

~~Pet. No. 1463~~ Pet: F. 291-92

Docket No 78 dated 1st Instt from the Supt of Inam Settlements in Mysore, stating that he has asked the Supt Mysore Rev. Survey to forward direct to this Office, the information called for in para 4 of the Decision of Govt on the appeal of Syed Ghous Shakhadri of Bababudan Darga, No 1826 of 1889-90, regarding the exact area and assessment of the Inam claimed by appellant, ~~[illegible]~~ the extent under cultivation &ca

Has the honor to invite attention to the Inam Superintendent's Communication referred to in the above and to request early submission of the information called for by Govt.

By order

15/5

Chief Secy

taken as correct. Survey Nos. 53 & 138 both appear in the Akarbands as Khrab. Survey No. 53 is waste and Survey No. 138 is cultivated. The Deputy Commissioner's letter No 1334 gives all the other heads of information called for in Government Decision on this case

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedt. Servant

Suptt. Mysore Red Survey

87. the appellant's representations are true.

Decision

Govt have gone over the case carefully and come to the decision that the land in question (S. Nos 53 & 138 aggregating 111 acres & 26 guntas) forms part of the Darga Inam. The question of quit-rent to be imposed will be referred to the Supt of Inams for Settlement according to Rules

259 / 291 of 92 — 16-8-02

30 / 11 Nov 02

Copy forwarded to the Supt of Inam Settlements ~~together~~ with ~~the records~~ reference to ~~read with~~ his docket No 41 of 16 Novr 1896

16-8-02
92 Enc. 4 files of records
The Dy. Commr.
Ch. together with
received with
No. 501 dated
90.

Draft
C 1 & 2

Secretary

Press
Copy put up
22/8

Sent
22/8/02